

Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT FILE NO.: CP02-069

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 3,550 square foot addition to an existing 7,100 square foot church.

PROJECT LOCATION: South side of Yerba Buena Road approximately 500 feet westerly of San Felipe Road (2750 Yerba Buena Rd.)

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: LDR (5 DU/AC)

ZONING: A-Agriculture

SURROUNDING LAND USES: Yerba Buena Road to the north. Single-family Residential to the west. Thompson Creek riparian corridor to the south and east.

PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS: Evergreen Valley Church, 2750 Yerba Buena Road, San José, CA 95121

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.						
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.						
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT(EIR) is required.						
	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.						
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, no further environmental analysis is required because all potentially significant effects have been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.						
Februa Date	ry 24, 2003						

File No. CP02-069			P	Page No.	2					
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources					
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:										
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		Ш			1,2					
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?					1,2					
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					1,2					
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					1,2					
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?					1,2					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the	ect:				1,3,4					
California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					1,3,4					
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?					1,3,4					
DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: No impacts. The site is currently developed with an existing church. MITIGATION MEASURES: None required. III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:										
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					1,14					
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		\boxtimes			1,14					
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					1,14					
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\boxtimes		1,14					
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					1,14					

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: There will be temporary short-term air quality impacts during construction.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With	Less Than Significant Impact	N/a	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------------	-----	------------------------

MITIGATION MEASURES: During construction, the following measures shall be incorporated to mitigate any possible significant air quality impacts.

- Water all active construction areas at least twice daily
- Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.
- Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

File No. CP02-069			P	Page No.	4
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project	:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					1,10,25
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					1,6,10,25
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?					1,6,25
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				\boxtimes	1,10,25
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?					1,11,25
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				\boxtimes	1,2,25
DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: No significant impacts. Construct Biological Assessment was prepared in January 2003 by Wetland assessment special status wildlife and plant species are not likely will remain unaffected by the construction of the proposed additionarking lot) located between the proposed area of addition and the present on the site. MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.	s Researce to occur in ons. There	h Associates, in the study ar e is existing de	Inc. Based ea. The ex evelopmen	l on the disting rate (build	results of riparian ha ling and p
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?					1,7,26
c) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or					1,8,26
site, or unique geologic feature? 1) Disturb any human remains including those interred outside of					1,8,26
d) Disturb any human remains including those interred outside of			∇		1020

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The area is in a known archaeologically sensitive area.

formal cemeteries?

MITIGATION MEASURES: Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and section 5097-94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California; in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonable suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The Santa Clara County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission, who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American. If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to State Law, then the applicant

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

shall re-enter the human remains and items associated with native American burials on property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

11. OLOLOGI MID DOLLO MOULUIC DIO	VI.	GEOLOGY AND SO	JILS - Would	the project
-----------------------------------	-----	----------------	---------------------	-------------

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)			1,5,24
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	\boxtimes		1,5,24
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			1,5,24
4) Landslides?		\boxtimes	1,5,24
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		\boxtimes	1,5,24
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			1,5,24
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			1,5,24
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			1,5,24

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The project is not located in a Geologic Hazard Zone.

MITIGATION MEASURES: Standard engineering and construction techniques will be incorporated into the project to mitigate potential adverse seismic/ground failure impacts to a non-significant level.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

-	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through		\boxtimes	1
	the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			
	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the		\boxtimes	1
	release of hazardous materials into the environment?			
	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an		\boxtimes	1
	existing or proposed school?			
	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the		\boxtimes	1,12
	public or the environment?			

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for				\boxtimes	1,2
f)	people residing or working in the project area? For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in				\boxtimes	1
g)	the project area? Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					1,2
	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?					1

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: No impacts. The project does not propose the use or storage of hazardous materials or toxic gases.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		\boxtimes		1,15
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit ir aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table leve (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				1
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?			\boxtimes	1
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?			\boxtimes	1
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				1,17
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		\boxtimes		1
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map of other flood hazard delineation map?			\boxtimes	1,9
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				1,9
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			\boxtimes	1
j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				1

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The increased amount of on-site impervious surface resulting from the project is negligible and will not substantially alter or increase the on-site runoff/drainage on the site. There will be temporary short-term water quality impacts during construction.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Cioniticant With	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
--------	--------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------

MITIGATION MEASURES: The applicant shall conform to the Non-Point Source Control requirement for storm water discharge associated with construction activity as required by the State Water Resource Control Board. Contact the Regional Water Quality Control Board at (415) 286-0968 for further information.

The following Best Management Practices shall be implemented:

- Silt barriers, such as straw bales and silt fences or basins are installed, as necessary, downstream of the work sites to avoid or minimize water quality impacts.
- Wet sediments may be stockpiled so water can drain or evaporate before removal to minimize water quality impacts or may be stockpiled within the channel as along as decanted water is not allowed to enter the live stream.
- No fueling, cleaning, or maintenance of vehicles or equipment takes place within channel banks to avoid the release of deleterious substances into surface waters.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?		\boxtimes	1,2
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		\boxtimes	1,2
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?		\boxtimes	1,2

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: No impacts. The project is consistent with the site's San Jose 2020 General Plan Land Use/ Transportation Diagram designation of General Commercial.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

File No. CP02-069	Page No. 8								
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources				
MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:									
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes	1,2,23				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes	1,2,23				
DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: No impacts. The project would no MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.	ot result ir	n the loss of kn	own mine	ral reso	ources.				
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:									
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?					1,2,13,18				
b)Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		\boxtimes			1				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?					1				
d)A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			\boxtimes		1				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes	1				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				\boxtimes	1				
 DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: There will be temporary noise im conditions will be placed in the permit to ensure that the construct requirements for noise levels and Zoning Ordinance for construct MITIGATION MEASURES: Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7: site work for the project. During construction operations, only a single piece of equipme All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, should be in factory silencing features. Mufflers shall be used on all h 	etion of th tion hours 00 p.m. N nt should proper o	e project is constitutions. Monday throug be allowed to operating cond	nsistent wi h Friday f operate at a ition and	for any	General Plan on-site or of				
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the pro	ject:	Г		L.					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				\boxtimes	1,2				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					1				
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes	1				

DISCUSSION IMPACTS: No impacts. The project under evaluation is consistent with the San Jose 2020 General Plan, for which an EIR was prepared and adopted under resolution numbers 65458.1 & 65459 by the San Jose City Council

File No. CP02-069	Page No. 9						
Issues	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources		
on August 16, 1994. The General Plan EIR evaluated cumulat from its implementation. As the project is consistent with the Gimpacts in this category beyond those addressed within the General	eneral Pla	an, it is not co					
MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.							
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:							
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:							
Fire Protection?				\boxtimes	1,2		
Police Protection?				\boxtimes	1,2		
Schools?					1,2		
Parks?				\boxtimes	1,2		
Other Public Facilities?				\boxtimes	1,2		
from its implementation. As the project is consistent with the Gimpacts in this category beyond those addressed within the General MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.			instacted to	Jiave	any additi		
XIV. RECREATION							
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				\boxtimes	1,2		
Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				\boxtimes	1,2		
DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: No impacts.							
MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.							
XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the pr	oject:						
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?			\boxtimes				
Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency		1			1,2,19		
for designated roads or highways? c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase				\boxtimes	1,2,19		

File No. CP02-069 Page No. 10 Less Than Potentially Less Than Significant With No Information Issues Significant Significant Mitigation *Impact* Sources **Impact Impact** Incorporated d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp \boxtimes 1,19 curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)? П П \boxtimes 1.20 e) Result in inadequate emergency access? \boxtimes f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? 1.18 g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting П П \boxtimes 1,2,18 alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? **DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS:** No impacts. MITIGATION MEASURES: None required. XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project: a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable П \boxtimes 1,15 Regional Water Quality Control Board? b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the \Box \boxtimes 1.2.21 П construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage \boxtimes 1,17 facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from П \Box \boxtimes 1,22 existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity \boxtimes 1,21 to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to П П \boxtimes \Box 1,21 accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related 1,21 \boxtimes to solid waste? DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: The project under evaluation is consistent with the San Jose 2020 General Plan, for which an EIR was prepared and adopted under resolution numbers 65458.1 & 65459 by the San Jose City Council on August 16, 1994. The General Plan EIR evaluated cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment facilities, water supplies, and landfills that would result from its implementation. As the project is consistent with the General Plan, it is not considered to have any additional impacts on these service systems beyond those addressed within the General Plan EIR MITIGATION MEASURES: None required. XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- \Box \bowtie \Box 1,10 sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal

community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of

the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Information Sources
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.					1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?					1

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS: All potentially significant impacts associated with the project will be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated into the project. There will be no cumulative impacts as a result of the project.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

EARLIER ANALYSIS

- 1. Earlier Analysis Used:
- 2. Impacts Adequately Addressed:
- 3. Mitigation Measures:

CHECKLIST REFERENCES

- 1. Environmental Clearance Application File No. CP02-069
- 2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
- 3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
- 4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
- 5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
- 6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
- 7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
- 8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
- 9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
- 10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
- 11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
- 12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
- 13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
- 14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
- 15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
- 16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
- 17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
- 18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
- 19. San Jose Department of Public Works
- 20. San Jose Fire Department
- 21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
- 22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
- 23. California Division of Mines and Geology
- 24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974
- 25. Biological Assessment of the Evergreen Church Property, Wetlands Research Associates, Inc, Jan. 2003.
- 26. Archaeological Evaluation of the Evergreen Valley Baptist Church, Archaeological Resource Service, Feb. 1986.